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Abstract:

Few studies have examined national identity processes in Latinx immigrant mothers and their children. This study uses a person-centered approach to examine how profiles of American and ethnic–racial identity are related to American and Latinx cultural values, group orientation, and socialization practices in a sample of 172 Latinx mother–youth dyads in an emerging immigrant community. Latent profile analyses produced a 4-profile solution for mothers (high-bicultural-, moderate-bicultural-, enculturated-, and assimilated-identity mothers) and a two-profile solution for youth (high- and low-bicultural identity) with respect to ethnic–racial and American identity. Mothers low in White cultural orientation and mainstream American values were more likely to be in the enculturated-identity profile, whereas mothers low in Latinx group orientation were more likely to be in the assimilated-identity profile. Likelihood of youth profile membership did not differ based on our covariates. Testing mean-level profile differences, high-bicultural mothers delivered the most frequent familism socialization messages and delivered more cultural socialization messages than assimilated and enculturated mothers. High-bicultural-identity youth reported receiving more familism socialization messages, but fewer promotion-of-mistrust messages than low-bicultural youth. Our results support past work finding relations between identifications, values, and behavioral practices for both host (Latinx) and receiving (American) cultures. Our study also highlights the fact that 3 of our 4 profiles of Latinx immigrant mothers (high-bicultural, moderate-bicultural, and assimilated mothers), an understudied population when it comes to national identity, are heavily incorporating a sense of being American into their identities.
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Article:

Questions of nationhood and national identity are of their nature complex, value-laden, and contested. It is important, nonetheless, that they be raised in national discourse. It is perhaps even more important that scholars avail themselves of a full range of historical
and contemporary evidence before reaching conclusions of threat, potential threat, and crisis in national identity.

—(Fraga & Segura, 2006, p. 286)

With the rapidly changing demographics of the United States, many politicians and policymakers have expressed concerns that America’s increasing diversity is undermining national unity and leading to a blurred, amorphous definition of what it means to be an American (Shelton, 2010). These concerns often come from a fundamental, underlying belief that to be an American is to be a White, English-speaking Protestant of European descent (Schildkraut, 2007). If one does not meet these criteria, one is apt to be labeled as “less American.” Concerns that ethnic–racial minorities are not assimilating, learning to uphold what are characterized as “traditional” values and customs, and developing strong identities as Americans are especially likely to be directed toward immigrants from Latin America (Citrin, Lerman, Murakami, & Pearson, 2007). These concerns may be especially strong among “emerging immigrant communities,” or rural communities primarily in the Midwest and Southeast that have been significantly influenced by large influxes of Latinx immigrants over the last 25 years (Stein, Gonzales, García Coll, & Prandoni, 2016). Even in these communities with particularly dense concentrations of Latinx immigrants, politically driven fears about this group not being “American enough” may not reflect the true lived experience of these Latinx immigrants and their children. This study, therefore, attempts to challenge the notion that Latinx immigrants and their children must and are not developing U.S. American identities by employing a person-centered approach to investigate the links between American and ethnic–racial identity (ERI), acculturative behaviors, and endorsement of mainstream American and Latinx cultural values among Latinx mothers and youth in an emerging immigrant community.

**Identity Processes in Latinx Communities**

Understanding identity processes for ethnic–racial minority groups in the United States involves a consideration of both national, U.S. American identity as well as ERI (Kiang, Witkow, & Champagne, 2013). Although American or national identity may be conceptualized differently by ethnic–racial group (Tsai, Mortensen, Wong, & Hess, 2002), common patterns of what it means to be American have emerged, such as a feeling of belonging and pride in being American, traits and behaviors like individualism and hard work ethic that are congruent with American ideals, use of the English language, and White/European physical characteristics which may or may not be achievable for certain immigrant populations (Park-Taylor et al., 2008; Rodriguez, Schwartz, & Krauss Whitbourne, 2010; Rodriguez et al., 2016; Schildkraut, 2007). These themes have been supported in this emerging literature, as Schwartz and colleagues (2012) found American identity to be positively associated with American cultural practices (measured by affinity for American customs and association with American peers) and individualism in a large, diverse sample of over 10,000 college students. However, these findings have not been replicated in recently immigrated Latinx populations, especially examining patterns of associations between American identity and American practices in mothers and their children. Because American identity is not well understood among Latinx immigrant mothers or Latinx youth, we aim to bridge this gap in the literature by quantifying individuals’ levels of American identity and by examining the correlates of American identity in these understudied populations.
When thinking about national identity processes in Latinx immigrants, it is also crucial to understand ERI. ERI, or the part of one’s identity associated with one’s ethnic–racial group membership, has been associated with numerous positive psychosocial outcomes (Hughes, Watford, & Del Toro, 2016) and may vary in salience based on the individual, the context, and the salience of other contextually relevant identities such as American identity (Umaña-Taylor, 2011). The multidimensional model of racial identity (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998) posits that racial centrality, the degree to which one defines oneself with regards to race, and private regard, or one’s positive or negative feelings about one’s racial group, are important aspects of this ethnic–racial group membership. ERI development, however, does not occur in isolation, and is likely impacted by a multitude of other factors, including the internalization of cultural values, participation in culturally appropriate behavior, and associations with other Latinx peers (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014), along with the influence of other identity statuses like American identity.

For example, in a large multiethnic study of first- and second-generation college students across the United States, the active exploration associated with achieved and moratorium personal identity statuses were related to higher American identity, ERI, and acculturation (Schwartz et al., 2013). This means that, as people more intently explore their identities, they more strongly identify concurrently with both their ethnic–racial group of origin and as an American. Similarly, positive longitudinal associations have also been found between ERI and American identity in Asian American adolescents (Gartner, Kiang, & Supple, 2014), cross-sectionally among Latinx college students (Gonzales-Backen et al., 2015), and using cluster analysis in a multiethnic sample of college students (Kiang, Yip, & Fuligni, 2008). Taken together, these findings refute prior literature finding an association between ERI and American identity for Whites but not for Blacks and Latinxs (Phinney, Cantu, & Kurtz, 1997). Furthermore, these findings suggest that American identity and ERI are important, related identity statuses that should be looked at together to help get a more holistic understanding of how identity processes operate in Latinx immigrant groups.

Although some of this work has been done with Latinx adolescents and college students, little work has explored ERI and American identity among Latinx adult immigrants, especially Latinx immigrant mothers. Scholarly work is needed to better understand this understudied population, as Latinx immigrant mothers not only have the task of acculturating and incorporating a sense of American identity into their sense of self, but are also responsible for delivering different socialization messages that may, in turn, impact their children’s identities (Kulish et al., 2019). Therefore, by concurrently examining ERI and American identity in both Latinx immigrant mothers and their children, we hope to increase our knowledge on these understudied groups by exploring how ERI and American identity statuses are associated with different types of value endorsement, orientation toward Latinx and White American culture and peers, and socialization behaviors for both Latinx youth and their mothers.

Multidimensional Model of Acculturation

To better examine the factors that influence a sense of ERI and American identity in Latinx immigrant families, we draw from Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, and Szapocznik (2010)
multidimensional model of acculturation. This model posits that acculturation is a multifaceted process whereby individuals’ and families’ practices, values, and ways of identifying themselves may each change from what is expected from one’s heritage culture, or culture of origin, to incorporate what is expected in one’s receiving or host culture leading to biculturalism. Although cultural practices influence values and values ultimately affect identity, these are three distinct constructs that may influence one another and the incorporation of host culture practices and values occur at different rates (Schwartz et al., 2010). For example, while Latinx individuals may quickly learn English (a cultural behavior), incorporating U.S. mainstream values (i.e., individualism) may not happen as quickly. It is important to note that this is not an assimilationist perspective but instead a view that immigrants can retain their own values and practices from their cultures of origin while also beginning to change their behaviors and endorse values of their host culture. Thus, it is important to take a nuanced approach in when trying to understand the multitude of factors that influence American identity by measuring both practices and values associated with enculturative and acculturative processes. In this study, we incorporate Schwartz et al., 2010 multidimensional model of acculturation by using a person-centered approach to examine how individuals’ behavioral practices (ethnic–racial socialization [ERS] messages, food, music, language, and peer preferences) and values (Latinx and mainstream American values) are related to different patterns of ERI and American identity among Latinx immigrant mothers and their children.

Links Between Practices, Values, and Identifications

Research on Latinx populations has found clear links between cultural value endorsement, behaviors, and ERI. For example, ERI has been associated with familial obligation and belonging, two core components of familism, as well as more frequent acts of family assistance among Latinx adolescents (Kiang & Fuligni, 2009) and Latinx orientation (Gonzalez, Stein, & Huq, 2013). Similarly, work with Latinx college students has found complex relations between ERI and familism respect values, where values and identity predict and reinforce each other over time (Stein, Rivas-Drake, & Camacho, 2017). Finally, Latinx mothers’ familism values have been associated indirectly with adolescents’ ERI beliefs through mothers’ socialization practices (Knight, Carlo, Streit, & White, 2017). Based on this prior literature, we expect to find Latinx cultural values and behavioral practices to be associated with greater levels of ERI centrality and private regard.

Although the relations between practices, values and ERI in Latinx populations are well understood, there is far less literature examining how practices and values influence American identity in Latinx populations. In a multiethnic sample of first- and second-generation emerging adults, Schwartz and colleagues (2013) found that those in more achieved national and ERI statuses endorsed higher American cultural value endorsement and engaging in more American behavioral practices. Similarly, latent trajectory models using a sample of recent Latinx immigrants found evidence of multiple profiles where individuals increased in American identifications in addition to American cultural values, behavioral practices, or both (Schwartz et al., 2015). This suggests that internalizing American values and adopting American practices are associated with increased American identity endorsement over time in Latinx populations. More work is needed to build upon these informative findings to help better illustrate the relations

Ethnic–Racial Socialization

ERS messages, or messages parents give to their children about the meaning and importance or race and ethnicity (Priest et al., 2014), are another important example of a behavioral practice that is likely influenced by mothers’ and youth’s identity statuses, or identifications (Hughes et al., 2008), and cultural value endorsement (Knight, Carlo, Mahrer, & Davis, 2016). These messages are typically classified into four main subtypes: cultural socialization messages, or messages about the history, culture, and traditions of one’s group; preparation for bias messages, which prepare kids to deal in a discriminatory society; egalitarian messages, which espouse racial equality; and promotion of mistrust messages, which encourages wariness when dealing with racial outgroup members (Hughes et al., 2006). Because ERS messages involve the passing on of ideas and attitudes related to ethnic–racial group membership, ERS shares a strong, bidirectional relationship with ERI (Hughes et al., 2016). For example, in a 2-year longitudinal study of 749 Mexican American fifth-graders and their families, Umana-Taylor and colleagues (2014) found that mothers’ ERS messages at Wave 1 predicted youth’s identity exploration and resolution 2 years later. More recent scholarship also suggests that mothers’ ERS messages mediate the relation between mothers’ and youth’s ERI (Derlan, Umaña-Taylor, Updegraff, & Jahromi, 2016, 2017). This means that parents’ identity beliefs affect the socialization messages they give and these messages, in turn, influence youth’s ERI. Although the links between ERS and ERI are well understood, little work has focused on the relation between socialization and American identity. Further, most of this work has focused on broad measures of cultural socialization that do not specify the cultural values being socialized, yet socialization of specific cultural values may be important to elucidate as these may vary. Due to the centrality of familism values for Latinx youth (Stein et al., 2014), we specifically examined familism socialization in addition to traditional measures of socialization (Kulish et al., 2019). Because of these nuanced relations between socialization messages, mothers’ ERI, and youth’s ERI, it is important to consider the role of ERS in impacting both ERI and American identity beliefs. This topic, however, has yet to be explored in the literature.

Goals and Hypotheses

In this study, we respond to calls asking for scholarship that creates a more thorough understanding of the relation between ERI and national identity (Carter & Pérez, 2016) and deepen our understanding on how Latinx immigrants incorporate American identity into their sense of selves (Citrin et al., 2007) by attempting to answer the question, “How do cultural value endorsement and behavioral practices influence ERI and American identity in Latinx youth and mothers in an emerging immigrant community?” We attempt to answer this question by identifying potential typologies, or profiles, of mothers’ and youth’s ERI and American identity beliefs and examining whether these profiles differ in terms of value endorsement and cultural orientation. We also extend the literature by examining whether the identity-based profiles found in youth and their mothers differ in self-reported ERS and familial value socialization messages.

We predict that (a) latent profile analyses (LPAs) will identify multiple distinct profiles
for mothers and youth in terms of ERI and American identity. Specifically in line with Berry’s (1997) separation strategy of acculturation where a subset of immigrants do not engage fully in the receiving culture, we predict that at least one profile will be low in American identity relative to the other profiles. Consistent with Schwartz and colleagues’ (2010) model of acculturation where practices and values influence how people identify themselves with respect to their receiving and heritage cultures, we predict that (b) mother and youth profiles will covary based on Latinx and White value endorsement and cultural orientation, with increases in White cultural orientation and mainstream value endorsement increasing the likelihood of membership in high-American-identity profiles relative to other profiles. Finally, given prior work theorizing that parents with stronger ERI’s deliver more positive socialization messages about pride, values, and traditions (Hughes et al., 2006), we predict that (c) mother profiles that are high in ERI will do more cultural and familial value socialization, whereas (d) youth profiles high in ERI will report having received more cultural and familial value socialization. Given the paucity of research on national identity and socialization, we made no predictions of how profiles high in American identity would be related to ERS.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants in this study were 172 Latinx mother–youth dyads recruited from two middle schools in an emerging immigrant community in central North Carolina between 2013 and 2015. All of the mothers in our sample were immigrants who had resided in the continental United States an average of 15.67 years (SD = 5.64). Of the 172 immigrant mothers, 89.6% of mothers were immigrants from Mexico and the rest were born in a U.S. territory or Latin American country (0.6% in Puerto Rico, 2.4% in El Salvador, 1.7% in Guatemala, 1.2% in Nicaragua, 1.2% in the Dominican Republic, 1.2% in Honduras, 0.6% in Colombia, and 0.6% in Ecuador). In this sample, the mean age for mothers was 38 years old. Youth were on average 12.9 years of age, 51.4% identified as female, and 86% reported being born in the United States. Mean family income was $23,020.35 (SD = $12,389.77) with an average of 4.72 (SD = 1.10) people living off that yearly income. Of the 14% of youth not born in the United States (n = 24) the average age of immigration was at 4.25 years of age (range = 0–12 years of age).

**Procedure**

After receiving Institutional Review Board approval, project staff recruited participants by using call lists of enrolled seventh- and eighth-grade students at two rural middle schools in North Carolina with large Latinx populations. To be eligible for the study, both biological parents had to be Latinx, the mother (or another biological female relative) had to be the in-home caretaker of the child, and the child had to be between 11 and 14 years of age. Trained research assistants visited eligible families’ homes, obtained assent and consent from the child and mother, and administered questionnaires to mothers and youth separately. All assessment materials were available in either English or Spanish and were administered based on the participants’ language preferences. Youth completed questionnaires using a computer assisted interview format while parents were interviewed by bilingual research assistants. Both mother and youth assessments took approximately two hours to complete. Mothers were paid $20 for completion of the
interview and children each received a $10 gift card for their participation (see Kulish et al., 2019 for detailed methods).

Measures

**Cultural values.** Both Mexican and mainstream cultural value endorsement were assessed using the Mexican American Cultural Values Scale for Adolescents and Adults (MACVS; Knight et al., 2010). The MACVS captures Mexican American values by measuring values like familism, *respeto*, and familial obligation, and uses items assessing independence and self-reliance, material success, and personal achievement to capture mainstream cultural values. In previous work with a sample of Mexican American adolescents and parents, the MACVS produced Cronbach’s alphas between .79 and .82 for the composite subscales (Gonzales, Dumka, Mauricio, & Germán, 2007; Roosa et al., 2008). On a 5-point scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*completely*), participants are asked to report the degree to which they agree with statements such as, “No matter what, children should always treat their parents with respect,” and “When there are problems in life, a person can only count on him/herself.” Reliability was acceptable for both youth (α = .93, Latinx values, α = .87 White mainstream values) and mothers (α = .89 Latinx values, α = .79 White mainstream values).

**Cultural practices.** Latinx and mainstream White cultural practices were assessed using the group of origin and White orientation subscales from an adapted version of the Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (Gim Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004). The Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale previously demonstrated reliabilities between .78 and .91. In the current study, the language was adapted to reference Latinx groups instead of Asian groups. White non-Latinx orientation was assessed by participants’ cultural knowledge, music and food consumption, and peer preferences specific to non-Latinx White culture. Participants then completed the same items specific to their Latinx cultural group of origin to assess the behavioral components of acculturation for both White and Latinx group of origin cultures. Items were rated on a 6-point scale from 1 (*not very well*) to 6 (*very well*). Sample items included, “How often do you listen to music or look at movies and magazines of the White mainstream group?” and “How much do you practice the traditions and keep the holidays of your own Latino group of origin?” These subscales displayed good internal consistency for both youth (α = .83 Latinx group of origin orientation, α = .87 non-Latinx White) and mothers (α = .84, Latinx group of origin orientation, α = .90 non-Latinx White cultural orientation).

**Ethnic–racial identity.** Mothers’ and youth’s self-report of their ethnic–racial identities was assessed using an adapted version of the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI; Sellers et al., 1998). Private regard, or an individual’s feelings about their ethnic–racial group, included items such as, “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments,” and centrality, or how central race/ethnicity is to one’s self-concept, included sample items such as, “Being a member of my ethnic group is an important reflection of who I am.” Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The MIBI has previously been adapted for use with Mexican American youth, producing Cronbach’s alphas of .64. In this sample of Latinx mothers and youth, this scale displayed good reliability, producing Cronbach’s alphas between .74 and .88 for private regard and .79 and .82 for ERI centrality.
**American identity.** Adapted from the MIBI (Sellers et al., 1998), American identity referred to how central being an American is to one’s self-concept, or American identity centrality, and American identity private regard, or one’s feelings about being American. Items were rated on a 5-point scale from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*), with higher scores indicating a stronger American identity. In previous work using a diverse sample, these adapted subscales showed good reliability, producing a Cronbach’s alpha score of .84 (Kiang et al., 2008). Sample items included, “Being American is an important reflection of who I am,” and “I feel good about being an American.” Reliability tests for the Centrality and Private Regard subscales produced Cronbach’s alphas between .89 and .99 for mothers and between .82 and .85 for youth.

**Ethnic–racial socialization.** ERS messages were assessed using the Parental Racial Socialization Scale (Hughes, 2003; Hughes & Chen, 1997), a 13-item scale assessing how frequently mothers delivered cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust messages. In previous work using a Latinx sample, this scale produced Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .74 to .87 across the three subscales (Hughes, 2003). Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale asking children how many times their mother engaged in specific socializing behaviors (1 = *never*, 5 = *six or more times*). Mothers and youth each gave self-reports on the frequency with which they delivered or received each type of ERS message. Sample items include, “How many times have you talked to your child about discrimination or prejudice against your ethnicity?” and “How often has your mother done or said other things to encourage you to learn about the history or traditions of your ethnic group?” Both the prep for bias (α = .80 moms, α = .82 youth) and cultural socialization (α = .85 moms, α = .78 youth) subscales displayed good reliability. Because the promotion of mistrust subscale consists of only two items, reliability tests were not conducted.

**Familial cultural value socialization.** The degree to which parents instill the Latinx cultural value of familism was assessed using a measure developed for the current study modifying Umaña-Taylor and Fine’s (2001) ethnic socialization scale. The modified scale included prompts specific to familism values and practices. Parents and youth reported the frequency of familism messages. Items were rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*), with higher scores indicating more frequent familial socialization. Sample items included, “My family talks about how important it is to rely on them in times of need,” and “My family encourages me to respect my elders and older siblings regardless of their differences in views.” Both convergent and discriminant validity were established (Kulish, Cavanaugh, & Stein, 2016). Reliability was .80 and .90 for mothers and youth, respectively.

**Results**

**Identifying Profiles**

We conducted two LPAs, one for mothers and one for youth, in Mplus Version 8.1 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2017) to determine whether profiles, or groups with underlying shared characteristics, could be found within our sample with respect to American and ERI centrality and private regard. To accomplish this, we started by comparing fit indices of models specifying between two and five typologies using the Akaike information criterion, sample-size adjusted
Bayesian information criteria, and the Lo–Mendell–Rubin likelihood ratio test (LRT), which compares a model with \( k \) classes to a model with \( k - 1 \) classes. A significant LRT \( p \) value indicates that a model with \( k \) classes fits the data better than a model with \( k - 1 \) classes (Nylund, Asparouhov, & Muthén, 2007). In choosing a model, we paid particular attention to a significant LRT, and looked to identify the point at which decreasing sample-size adjusted Bayesian information criteria levels begin to level off (B. O. Muthén, personal communication, June 5, 2013). Using these three main indicators while also examining model entropy, an indicator where values above .80 indicate good classification quality (Muthén, 2007), we concluded that a four-profile solution best represented the data for mothers and a two-profile solution for youth (see Table 1 for model fit indices). Unstandardized means for each predictor in each profile are presented in Table 2. Missing data were addressed using full information maximum likelihood.

### Table 1. Model Fit Indices for Latent Profile Analyses of Latinx Mothers’ and Youth’s American and Ethnic–Racial Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>Adjusted BIC</th>
<th>Entropy</th>
<th>LRT ( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother profiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-profile model</td>
<td>1,544.23</td>
<td>1,585.14</td>
<td>1,543.98</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-profile model</td>
<td>1,423.79</td>
<td>1,480.45</td>
<td>1,423.45</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-profile model</td>
<td>1,333.64</td>
<td>1,406.04</td>
<td>1,333.21</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-profile model</td>
<td>1,291.72</td>
<td>1,379.85</td>
<td>1,291.18</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth profiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-profile model</td>
<td>1,363.36</td>
<td>1,404.27</td>
<td>1,363.11</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-profile model</td>
<td>1,271.43</td>
<td>1,328.09</td>
<td>1,271.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-profile model</td>
<td>1,221.47</td>
<td>1,293.87</td>
<td>1,221.04</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; LRT = Lo–Mendell–Rubin likelihood ratio test. The best fitting model for mothers and youth are in bold.

### Table 2. Unstandardized Means and Standard Errors of Mother and Youth American and Ethnic–Racial Identity (ERI; \( N = 175 \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High-bicultural ID ( (N = 75) )</th>
<th>Moderate-bicultural ID ( (N = 52) )</th>
<th>Enculturated ID ( (N = 33) )</th>
<th>Assimilated ID ( (N = 12) )</th>
<th>Sample M ( (N = 172) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother profiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American ID centrality</td>
<td>3.86 (.03)</td>
<td>2.66 (.09)</td>
<td>1.61 (.08)</td>
<td>3.36 (.11)</td>
<td>3.04 (.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American ID private regard</td>
<td>3.81 (.06)</td>
<td>3.09 (.09)</td>
<td>1.32 (.19)</td>
<td>3.42 (.09)</td>
<td>3.09 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERI centrality</td>
<td>4.70 (.06)</td>
<td>4.33 (.10)</td>
<td>4.35 (.16)</td>
<td>2.68 (.32)</td>
<td>4.39 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERI private regard</td>
<td>4.79 (.04)</td>
<td>4.51 (.09)</td>
<td>4.57 (.09)</td>
<td>2.91 (.22)</td>
<td>4.54 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth profiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American ID centrality</td>
<td>3.36 (.07)</td>
<td>4.50 (.07)</td>
<td>4.50 (.07)</td>
<td>3.89 (.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American ID private regard</td>
<td>3.55 (.07)</td>
<td>4.69 (.06)</td>
<td>4.69 (.06)</td>
<td>4.09 (.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERI centrality</td>
<td>3.85 (.09)</td>
<td>4.40 (.08)</td>
<td>4.40 (.08)</td>
<td>4.11 (.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERI private regard</td>
<td>4.10 (.09)</td>
<td>4.59 (.07)</td>
<td>4.59 (.07)</td>
<td>4.32 (.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ID = identity.

**Mother profiles.** The largest typology (43.6% of the total sample), which we refer to as high-bicultural identity consisted of Latinx mothers who were high in both ERI and American identity centrality and private regard. The second largest profile (30.2% of the sample), the moderate-bicultural-identity profile, consisted of mothers who were at and near the mean in both ERI and American identity variables. The next profile (19.2%) included mothers who were average in ERI centrality and private regard, but over 1.5 SD below the mean in American identity
centrality and private regard. This profile is referred to as enculturated identity. Finally, the fourth and smallest profile (6.8%) is described as the assimilated-identity profile. This small profile included mothers who were slightly above average in American identity, but more than 2 SD below the mean in ERI centrality and private regard. Standardized identity scores for each profile are plotted in Figure 1. Overall, ERI and American identity were not correlated in our sample of first-generation Latinx moms, $r = .10, p = .21$. Chi-square difference tests indicated that mother profiles did not differ with respect to the number of years they had resided in the United States.

![Figure 1. Mother’s standardized scores on American and ethnic–racial identity subscales. cent = centrality; privr = private regard.](image)

**Youth profiles.** Only two profiles were identified among our sample of Latinx youth, a low-bicultural-identity profile (53% of the sample), where youth were slightly below the mean in ERI and American identity, and a high-bicultural-identity profile (47%), where youth were close to 1 SD above the mean in ERI and American identity. The small differences between these two profiles and the high mean levels of ERI and American identity suggests that these youth are largely bicultural, feeling connected to both their American and Latinx identities. Unlike what was found with mothers, ERI and American identity were positively correlated among youth, $r = .25, p = .001$. Chi-square difference tests indicated that youth in the low-bicultural-identity profile had immigrated to the United States later than youth in the high-bicultural-identity profile ($\chi^2 = 15.50, p < .001$). Specifically, the mean age of immigration was about 9 years 11 months for low-bicultural-identity youth and 3 years 3 months for high-bicultural-identity profile. There were no gender differences with respect to profile membership ($\chi^2 = .06, p = .81$).

**Profile Covariates**

Our next step was to consider potential covariates associated with our different mother and youth profiles. This was done by running a multinomial logistic regression where each of our covariates: Latinx cultural values, mainstream values, Latinx culture of origin orientation,
and White cultural orientation are regressed on profile membership. This produces odds ratios telling us how a 1-point increase in our covariate increases or decreases the likelihood of being sorted into one profile relative to a reference profile. These analyses allow us to test Schwartz and colleagues’ (2010) model of acculturation and understand how cultural values and practices influence individuals’ identifications, or patterns of ERI and American identity. Table 3 shows odds ratios illustrating the likelihood of profile membership for mothers based on our covariates. Consistent with our hypotheses, mothers low in White cultural orientation and mainstream values were more likely to be classified as enculturated-identity mothers compared to all other profiles. Similarly, mothers low in Latinx orientation were more likely to be in the assimilated-identity profile compared to all other profiles. Latinx cultural value endorsement did not predict profile membership. None of our four covariates predicted high-bicultural-identity profile membership relative to moderate-bicultural-identity membership, suggesting that mothers in these profiles were equally likely to endorse similar levels of mainstream values, Latinx cultural values, White cultural orientation, and Latinx culture of origin orientation. Covariates also did not predict membership into the low- and high-bicultural-identity profiles for youth.

Table 3. Multinomial Logistic Regression Linking Mother Cultural Values to Relative Likelihood of Class Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Latinx cultural values</th>
<th>Mainstream values</th>
<th>Latinx culture of origin orientation</th>
<th>White cultural orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-bicultural ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-bicultural ID</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturated ID average ID</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilated ID enculturated ID</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-bicultural ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilated ID enculturated ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturated ID average ID</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilated ID enculturated ID</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturated ID average ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilated ID enculturated ID</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. OR = odds ratio; ID = identity. Boldface indicates significant results.

Table 4. Means by Profile in Mother-Reported Socialization Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization message</th>
<th>High-bicultural ID (P1)</th>
<th>Moderate-bicultural ID (P2)</th>
<th>Enculturated ID (P3)</th>
<th>Assimilated ID (P4)</th>
<th>Significant differences</th>
<th>Significant p-column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prep for bias</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural socialization</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>P1 &gt; P3, P4^&lt; .0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of mistrust</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>P1 &gt; P2, P3, &lt;.001, .01^b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familism socialization</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>P1 &gt; P2, P3^&lt; .001, .01^b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ID = identity; n/a = not applicable. Superscripts signify significant differences and correspond to specific p-values in the p-column.

Mean-Level Profile Differences

The final step in our analyses was to examine mean-level differences between profiles with respect to socialization practices. Chi-square tests were run to test for profile differences in self-
reported frequency of cultural socialization, prep for bias, promotion of mistrust, and familism value socialization for both mothers’ and youth’s profiles. Table 4 illustrates means and significant differences in socialization frequency for mothers’ profiles.

**Mothers’ profile differences.** Overall, the high-bicultural-identity group for mothers evidenced the greatest number of profile differences. Consistent with our hypotheses, high-bicultural-identity mothers gave more frequent familial value messages than all other profiles and also delivered more cultural socialization messages than the assimilated-identity \( (p < .001) \) and enculturated-identity \( (p = .04) \), but not the moderate-bicultural-identity group \( (p = .22) \). Assimilated-identity mothers also delivered fewer cultural socialization messages than the moderate-bicultural-identity \( (p = .001) \) and enculturated-identity groups \( (p = .01) \). All four profiles of mothers gave prep for bias and promotion of mistrust messages with similar frequency.

**Youth’s profile differences.** Similar to differences seen in mothers’ profiles, high-bicultural-identity youth reported receiving more familial value socialization messages compared to low-bicultural-identity youth \( (p < .001) \). Also similar to what was found among mothers’ profiles, youth profiles did not differ in the self-reported number of prep for bias messages received \( (p = .44) \). Surprisingly, individuals in the low- and high-bicultural-identity profiles did not differ in the number of cultural socialization messages they received \( (p = .24) \). Individuals in the low-bicultural-identity profile did, however, receive more promotion of mistrust messages than high-bicultural-identity youth \( (p = .04) \).

**Discussion**

To challenge the White-equals-American bias (Devos & Mohamed, 2014) and the pervasive belief that Latinx immigrants are not engaging in American culture, endorsing American values, and developing American identities (Citrin et al., 2007), this study intended to both identify profiles of ERI and American identity among Latinx mothers and their children and apply Schwartz and colleagues’ (2010) model of acculturation by examining potential links between profile membership, value endorsement, group orientation, and socialization behaviors. Specifically, the first aim of the current study was to utilize LPAs to uncover typologies of ethnic–racial and American identity endorsement among Latinx youth and their mothers. In general, there was far greater variability in the configurations of mothers’ ERI and American identity centrality and private regard than there was for youth. Because of the high mean levels of ERI and American identity among our youth our LPA produced just two profiles, highlighting that these largely second-generation youth are bicultural, with slight differences in the degree of biculturality due in part to their time in the United States. These results are supported by the acculturation gap literature showing that second generation Latinx youth are almost uniformly more acculturated into American society than their first-generation parents (Telzer, Yuen, Gonzales, & Fuligni, 2016). Also of note is that neither White nor Latinx orientation and cultural value endorsement predicted youth profile membership, further suggesting that the differences between these profiles are small with respect to identity and behavioral acculturative processes.

Our LPA with mothers, by contrast, produced very distinct classes with clear differences in identity endorsement. Importantly, the largest group identified reported high levels of both ERI
and American identity and constituted a little less than half of the sample (44%) and another 30% had similar ERI and American identity both at the mean level. A sample mean of 3.06 for mothers’ American identity means that mothers generally agree with items such as “I have a strong sense of belonging to America” and “I have a strong attachment towards America.” This suggests that about 75% of our sample of Latinx immigrant mothers, who had lived in an emerging immigrant setting in the United States for an average of only 15 years, do incorporate American identity into their sense of self and feel positively about being American. Unlike narratives that pose that Latinx immigrants do not integrate into the broader U.S. culture (Citrin et al., 2007), this study finds that indeed many Latinx immigrants identify as American as well as Latinx.

Moreover, our findings also diverge from the literature finding lower levels of American identity endorsement among minority college students (Rodriguez et al., 2010), suggesting that identity endorsement patterns may be unique for Latinx mothers and therefore deserving of further study. These differences may be a result of using comparative approaches (i.e., identity processes between groups) that may hide important within group variability that is important to understand. Overall, 75% of the mothers in our sample endorsed identity patterns consistent with bicultural identity, which was the typical pattern in the youth as described above. This means that about one quarter of the sample demonstrated profiles that were either enculturated (19%) or assimilated (7%), with the enculturated profile including mothers low in American identity while assimilated-identity mothers were high in American identity but low in ERI. One potential explanation for the high degree of American identity endorsement may be because of these women’s status as parents of American citizen youth. It is possible that by raising a child who identifies as American and endorses a bicultural identity, these mothers learn to incorporate a sense of being American into their self-concept. Thus, models of Latinx parenting and developmental processes should consider how mothers incorporate their changing identity and cultural value endorsement into their parenting and socialization of their Latinx youth, and vice versa. Theories of Latinx parenting have focused on how traditional Latinx cultural values influence parenting processes (i.e., Calzada, Fernandez, & Cortes, 2010; Grau, Azmitia, & Quattlebaum, 2009), and this work can be extended by also incorporating how the host country’s values are integrated into traditional value endorsement. Future work should aim to explore these questions by comparing how Latinx immigrant mothers and Latinx immigrant women without children develop American identities.

Aiding the external validity of our findings, our four profiles generally align with three of the four acculturation strategies—integration, assimilation, separation/segregation, and marginalization—proposed by Berry (1997). Berry asserts that these four strategies are derived from two choices: choosing to maintain or lose one’s cultural identity and choosing whether or not to make and maintain relationships within mainstream society. Our high-bicultural-identity and moderate-bicultural-identity mothers who endorse moderate to high levels of ERI and American identity would likely identify with Berry’s (1997) “integration” strategy because these individuals are maintaining their cultural identity while also adopting a new, American identity. Similarly, our assimilated mothers who are high in American identity but low in ERI directly align with Berry’s “assimilation” acculturation strategy, which involves adopting the identity of a new society to blend in with the mainstream. Finally, our enculturated mothers would likely practice Berry’s “separation” strategy, as they endorse low American, or host culture, identity
while maintaining a strong Latinx ERI. Similar to Berry, Phinney, Sam, and Vedder’s (2006) large “integration” cluster in their sample of multiethnic, multinational college students, our high- and low-bicultural-youth profiles were high on ERI and American identity, suggesting a high level of comfort with both host (American) culture and youth’s (Latinx) culture of origin. Our results are similar to previous literature finding support for several different acculturation strategies, the most common being an integrated or bicultural strategy. However, using just ERI and American identity in the creation of our profiles, we are able to quantify and illustrate the predictors and correlates of these acculturation strategies in a sample of Latinx mothers and youth.

Identity Profiles, Values Endorsement, and Group Orientation

The second aim of our study was to examine whether cultural orientation and cultural values, key factors in acculturation, and predicted mother and youth profile membership. Whereas the likelihood of profile membership did not change based on our covariates for high- and low-bicultural youth, the likelihood of profile membership for mothers did change based on cultural values and orientation. Covariate differences were as expected, with Enculturated mothers endorsing fewer mainstream values and lower White orientation (i.e., cultural knowledge, peer preference, music and food consumption) while assimilated-identity mothers endorsed low Latinx orientation compared to the three other profiles. High-bicultural-identity and moderate-bicultural-identity mothers differed mainly in the degree to which they endorsed American identities, with bicultural mothers scoring around 1 point, or approximately 1 SD, higher on 5-point American identity measures. The two profiles did not differ on any of our covariates, suggesting that the discrepancy in American identity endorsement does not relate to any appreciable differences in value endorsement or preference for White versus Latinx peers, entertainment, or culture. Essentially, even though moderate-bicultural-identity Latinx mothers may feel “less American,” they are equally likely to endorse the same American cultural values and engage in the same mainstream “American” behaviors as high-bicultural-identity mothers.

Furthermore, mothers high in mainstream values and White orientation were far more likely to be sorted into the high-bicultural-, moderate-bicultural-, and assimilated-identity profiles than the en culturated profile. Enculturated mothers had an average American identity centrality of 1.61 and an average private regard of 1.32 on a 0-to-4 scale, placing this small profile (7% of our sample of mothers) between 1 and 2.5 points below the other profiles on American identity measures. Taken together, this suggests that, 81% of mothers in our sample are endorsing moderate to high-American-identity, mainstream values, and White group orientation. These findings highlight the multidimensional, nonlinear, nonuniform nature of acculturation (Lopez-Class, Castro, & Ramirez, 2011), while also demonstrating how the acculturative process can lead to different types of identifications, value endorsements and group orientations among Latinx mothers.

Identity Profiles and Socialization

Our final aim of the study was to understand how mother and youth profiles differed with respect to ERS and familism cultural value socialization. Although prep for bias and promotion of mistrust messages did not differ across profiles, there were significant profile differences in the
number of self-reported familism and cultural socialization messages given to youth. Overall, a pattern emerged where high-bicultural-identity mothers delivered more familism socialization messages than all other profiles, and more cultural socialization than all but the moderate-bicultural-identity profile. Unsurprisingly, Assimilated mothers gave cultural socialization messages with the lowest frequency. These results suggest that high-bicultural mothers, who endorse high levels of ERI and American identity, are delivering the greatest number of messages relating to traditional Latinx history, culture, traditions, and values, but that this high degree of Latinx socialization is not done for lack of a strong identification with American values and culture. By giving messages pertinent to Latinx culture while concurrently holding strong American identity beliefs these mothers are demonstrating both integration, forming connections separate cultures while leaving each culture unaltered, and frame switching, or using a specific cultural system based on context (West, Zhang, Yampolsky, & Sasaki, 2017). Because biculturalism has been shown to lead to positive parenting outcomes in Latinx families such as fewer aversive and more warm interactions (Gassman-Pines & Skinner, 2018), as well as increased perceptions of general parenting competence (Kiang, Glatz, & Buchanan, 2017), future work should more thoroughly examine the practical implications of biculturalism among Latinx mothers.

Chi-square difference tests supported our hypotheses that the Latinx youth highest in ERI, the high-bicultural profile, would receive more familism cultural value socialization messages. Additionally, profiles did not differ in cultural socialization or prep for bias messages. One surprising profile difference, however, Low Bicultural youth reported receiving more promotion of mistrust messages, or messages telling them to be wary of non-Latinxs, compared to high-bicultural youth. This implies that, even though 81% of the mothers in our sample are feeling American and endorsing moderate to high-American-identity centrality and private regard, some mothers are still communicating some level of mistrust of mainstream White America to their children. This finding is in line with work that has found that, among a national sample of Mexican Americans, acculturation leads to loss of trust in the American political system, which may be partly due to an increased awareness of racism and discrimination (Michelson, 2003). Although ethnic–racial minorities may feel American, they could also feel that they are not thought of as prototypically American, and this implicit American-equals-White belief has been found to influence White Americans’ anti-immigration policy attitudes and acculturation ideologies (Huynh, Devos, & Altman, 2015). It is possible that Latinx immigrant mothers perceive that individual Whites and U.S systems designed to benefit Whites do not think of them as American regardless of how they self-identify, causing these mothers to reflexively give promotion of mistrust messages to their children as a response to this prejudice. Furthermore, the literature is still unclear of what first-generation Latinx mothers mean when they endorse feeling American. It is possible that many of these mothers endorse feeling American because having second-generation American children causes them to feel more American, even if these mothers still harbor mistrust toward Whites—fearing mistreatment and discrimination toward both them and their children. Ultimately, more work is needed to understand the meaning of “being American” for first-generation Latinx mothers and to understand how the mistrust of Whites they are communicating to their children fits into and impacts their American Identity.

Building upon the notion that raising American children may impact Latinx immigrant mothers’ identity endorsement, our study has implications for how we understand parenting in this
population. Past theoretical work in Latinx parenting (Grau et al., 2009) focuses on the distinction between culture-general parenting behaviors, which are posited to be common to parents of many ethnic–racial groups, and culture-specific parenting behaviors, which have unique impacts on family functioning by group. These culture-specific behaviors are theorized to lead to positive youth development because they give youth the skills and values needed in their current environments. As our results show, our Latinx immigrant mothers have clear differences in terms of identity endorsement, cultural value endorsement, and socialization behaviors. Regardless of these differences, however, these mothers are producing moderately to highly bicultural children. This lends support for the notion that these parents recognize that instilling American values may lead to positive youth outcomes because American economic, educational, and social systems reward these values and behaviors (Grau et al., 2009). However, at the same time, heritage values could have equal significance and may lead to other positive psychological outcomes such as lower externalizing behavior and higher family cohesion due to emphases on traditional Latinx values such as familism and respeto (Stein et al., 2014). There may also be a bidirectional influence whereby Latinx youth, who may develop American identities through proximal influences in their environment, are demonstrating these American values and helping socialize their parents into American society. These actions may then affect how these Latinx immigrant mothers, who are already trying to maintain a balance between acculturating their children while instilling traditional values, see themselves, their own identities, and their own values. Ultimately, future work is needed to test this claim and tease apart the complex relations between Latinx mothers’ parenting practices, identities, and values those of their children.

Limitations

Although our study helps to fill some important gaps in the literature, it is not without its limitations. First, the present study uses cross-sectional data, which inherently limits the degree to which we can assert causation when looking at links between identity, socialization, and acculturative processes such as cultural value endorsement and group orientation. Future work should utilize longitudinal research designs to better tease apart these complex, bidirectional relations. A second consideration is the generalizability of our findings. Our sample was drawn from an emerging immigrant community in rural North Carolina in 2013–2015. Emerging immigrant communities are typically rural communities whose structural, social, and economic systems have been greatly changed due to large influxes of Latinx immigrants (Stein et al., 2016). Although it is encouraging that our findings support links between acculturation and American identity that have been previously found among a national sample of multiethnic second-generation college students (Schwartz et al., 2013), differences in state and local politics, economics, and social climate due to the increased density of Latinx immigrants in the community we sampled from may have nonetheless influenced the types of ERS, cultural value endorsement, group identification, and identity beliefs reported by our sample. Additionally, the national discourse for Latinx communities shifted in 2016 with increased attention to immigration policies, and, given that national discourse and policies impact Latinx health and mental health outcomes, these findings may be different in the current sociopolitical climate. Future work should, therefore, attempt to replicate this work today in different social and geographical contexts, including areas not designated as emerging immigrant communities.
Finally, although our study identifies groups of Latinx mothers and youth displaying patterns of ethnic–racial and American identity and relates these patterns to socialization messages, cultural orientation, and cultural values, our quantitative study is unable to examine the subjective meaning of being American for these groups of Latinx mothers and children. Future qualitative and mixed-methods work should be used to identify what being American means to Latinx youth and families and attempt to identify differences in meaning between individuals who endorse display different patterns of ethnic–racial and American identity.

Implications

This study has implications for the societal treatment of Latinx families. Chiefly, this study shows that a majority of Latinx immigrant mothers are integrating a sense of being American into their self-concept, regardless of the amount of time they have lived in the United States. Because this is an important identity status for these mothers, clinicians and researchers seeking to perform cultural adaptations of existing interventions should take into account these mother’s different identity statuses and the complex interplay between their identities, Latinx cultural values, “American” values, and culturally based behaviors and not assume an acculturation gap between youth and their parents.

Our finding that many Latinx immigrant mothers endorse having developed American identities is all the more important given the current political discourse surrounding immigration in the United States. Menjívar and Abrego (2012) argued that, with the changing political climate, the United States has promoted “legal violence,” which involves the increased convergence between criminal law and immigration law and leads to the dehumanization of Latinx immigrants and “sanctioned social suffering” that “is at once structural in that it is exerted without identifiable perpetrators,” and “is symbolic in that it is so thoroughly imposed by the social order that it becomes normalized as part of the cognitive repertoire of those exposed” (p. 1413). This can be seen in qualitative work with Latinx families linking anti-immigrant sentiment to increased discrimination, stress, depression, and fear (Ayón & Beccerra, 2013). Recent qualitative work has also shown that immigration news and actions can lead to significant increases in psychological distress among Latinx parents, regardless of residency status (Roche, Vaquera, White, & Rivera, 2018). In a society where Latinx immigrants are forced to guard themselves and their children against both societal and institutional discrimination (Ayón, 2018), empirical data affirming that immigrant families often endorse similar behaviors, values, and identifications Americans may go a long way in highlighting that the diverse American people have many more things in common than they might believe. This recognition of our shared identity as Americans is, therefore, needed in our academic work and in the public discourse to combat the social and structural impediments faced by Latinx immigrants in today’s society. Furthermore, these data highlight the resilience of Latinx immigrant families and their ability to hold onto these values and weave themselves into the fabric of American society despite the everyday discrimination coming from high-profile social and political entities.

Conclusions

In the current study we utilized a person-centered framework to understand the typologies of ERI and American identity beliefs displayed by Latinx youth and their mothers. We also examined
how the likelihood of being classified into a particular profile changed as a function of Latinx and White orientation and cultural value endorsement. Finally, we tested for mean-level profile differences with respect to ERS and familism value socialization messages. Our results indicate that Latinx youth display a great deal of biculturalism, although differences in the degree of biculturalism may be due to differences in immigration age and ERS received as opposed to differences in value endorsement or group orientation. Furthermore, our results indicate that there is a great degree of variability in the ERI and American identity beliefs of Latinx mothers, although the high-bicultural-identity (44%) and moderate-bicultural-identity (30.3%) profiles made up a majority of the sample. Further analyses revealed that the likelihood of high group orientation and value endorsement varied by mother profile, and that mean-level differences existed between mother profiles with respect to the frequency of cultural and familism socialization. Overall, our study constitutes a timely addition to the literature, helping shed light on the factors associated with ERI and American identity among a sample of second-generation Latinx youth and their largely first-generation mothers. Hopefully, these findings may help to dispel stigma levied against Latinx immigrants by challenging the notion that Latinx immigrants do not see themselves as American or endorse “American values,” while also helping to dispel the harmful American-equals-White bias and general anti-immigrant sentiment that has become increasingly salient in American society. Future work should continue to utilize person-centered approaches as a tool to better understand American identity and promote social justice (see Neblett et al., 2016, for recommendations), while also continuing to explore the psychosocial and parenting outcomes associated with biculturalism.

Resumen

Pocos estudios han examinado los procesos de identidad nacional en las madres inmigrantes Latinas y sus hijos. Este estudio utiliza un análisis centrado en el individuo APPROACH para examinar cómo se relacionan los perfiles de identidad estadounidense y étnico-racial (Latinxs) con los valores culturales, la orientación grupal y las prácticas de socialización étnica en una muestra de 172 madres y jóvenes Latinx en una comunidad emergente de inmigrantes. Los análisis de perfiles latentes produjeron una solución de cuatro perfiles para las madres (madres de alta identidad bicultural, moderada, bicultural y asimilada) y una solución de dos perfiles para jóvenes (alta y baja identidad bicultural) con respecto a la identidad étnico-racial y estadounidense. Las madres con poca orientación cultural blanca y los valores estadounidenses tenían más probabilidades de estar en el perfil de Identidad Enculturada, mientras que las madres con poca orientación en el grupo Latinx tenían más probabilidades de estar en el perfil de Identidad Asimilada. La probabilidad de membresía del perfil juvenil no difirió según nuestras covariables. Al probar las diferencias en los perfiles, las madres de Alto Nivel Bicultural entregaron los mensajes de socialización de familismo más frecuentes y entregaron más mensajes de socialización cultural que las madres Asimiladas y Enculturadas. Los jóvenes de Alta Identidad Bicultural informaron haber recibido más mensajes de socialización de familismo, pero menos promoción de mensajes de desconfianza que los jóvenes de Baja Bicultura. Nuestros resultados respaldan el trabajo anterior, encontrando relaciones entre identificaciones, valores y prácticas de comportamiento tanto para las culturas anfitrionas (Latinx) como para las culturas (estadounidenses) receptoras. Nuestro estudio también destaca el hecho de que tres de nuestros cuatro perfiles de madres inmigrantes Latinx (Alta Bicultural, Bicultural Moderada y Madres
Asimiladas), una población poco estudiada cuando se trata de identidad nacional, están incorporando en gran medida el sentido de ser estadounidenses en sus identidades.
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